

**RECEIVED**  
**CENTRAL FAX CENTER****APR 02 2007****IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

**APPLICANT:** Matt Ayers                      **ART UNIT:** 2144  
**SERIAL NO.:** 09/575,839                      **EXAMINER:** Thanh Nguyen  
**FILED:** 05/22/2000  
**FOR:** Method and System for Directing  
Requests for Content to a  
Content Server Based on  
Network Performance

**ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.: 52224/296056**

Commissioner for Patents  
Mail Stop Appeal Brief  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMITTAL**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile  
transmitted to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office's  
Centralized Facsimile Number of 571.273.8300 on April 2,

2007.  
  
Melody T. Wilson

**REPLY BRIEF TO EXAMINER'S ANSWER**

Sir:

This Reply Brief is submitted under 37 CFR § 41.41(a) in response to the  
Examiner's Answer mailed on February 8, 2007.

04/03/2007 TL0111 00000007 09575839

02 FC:2402

250.00 0P

**Table of Contents**

|   | <b><u>Page</u></b> |
|---|--------------------|
| I. Reply to Examiner's Grounds of Rejection .....   | 3                  |
| II. Reply to Examiner's Response to Arguments ..... | 4                  |
| III. Conclusion .....                               | 6                  |

# **I. Reply to Examiner's Grounds of Rejection**

For each rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103, the Examiner's Answer must "state the ground of rejection and point out where each of the specific limitations recited in the rejected claims is found in the prior art." MPEP 1207.02(A)(9)(d)(i).

The Examiner alleged that Fig. 1 of Colby "shows directing the network client to content servers" and relied upon Fig. 1 of Colby to reject the element of Claim 1 that requires otherwise, directing the first network client to a said one of said content servers . . . based on communication between a second client, that is physically proximate to the first network client, and one or more of the plurality of content servers. The Examiner's grounds of rejection do not address a second client that is proximate to the first network client or using communications between a second network client and a plurality of servers to select one of the servers for the first network client. Claims 12, 33 and 44 contain similar elements and the Examiner simply reiterated the arguments used to reject Claim 1 to reject Claims 12, 33 and 44. The Examiner's grounds of rejection for Claims 1, 12, 33 and 44 fail to point out where in the prior art the elements of (i) a second client that is proximate to the first network client, and (ii) using communications between a second network client and a plurality of servers to select one of the servers for the first network client are found.

Although the Examiner is required to reevaluate his or her position in light of the arguments presented in the brief, it appears that the Examiner simply reiterated the rejections made in the Office Action dated June 30, 2005 in the Examiner's Grounds

of Rejection.

## **II. Reply to Examiner's Response to Arguments**

The Examiner's Answer does not address each of the arguments presented in the Appel Brief. The Appeal Brief argued that neither Colby nor Spicer describe selecting a content server for a first client based on measurements associated with another client that is physically proximate to the first client. *See e.g.* pp. 12-13 of Appellant's Brief. The Examiner failed to address this argument. Instead, the Examiner mischaracterizes appellant's argument as an argument that "Spicer does not describe 'a first client and a second network client.'" Appellant's brief contains the following on page 13.

The cited section of Spicer describes that multiple points of presence (POPs) can be connected to a network. Although Spicer describes that a given geographic location, such as a metropolitan area, is served by multiple network service providers and each network service provider provides a POP, the cited section of Spicer does not describe that measurements between one POP and a server can be used for routing communications from a separate POP that is physically proximate to the first POP.

Appellant is not arguing that Spicer does not describe multiple POPs, but that Spicer does not describe selecting a server for a first client based on measurements between a second client and a plurality of servers, where the second client is physically proximate to the first client.

The Appeal Brief argued against the Examiner's combination of Colby and Spicer by stating that the references use different criteria to select a server and that

there was no citation as to how the differences in the different criteria could be resolved. For example, what to do if the performance measurement information used by Spicer contradicted the geographical or topological information used by Colby. The Examiner's Answer did not address these arguments, but instead simply repeated the reasons for combination given in the Office Action dated June 30, 2005 verbatim.

The Appeal Brief argued against the Examiner's combination of Colby, Spicer and Jang by stating that Jang is directed to mobile telephones and Colby and Spicer are directed to computer networks and that there was no citation as to how differences in the signal formats and protocols used in the different networks could be reconciled. The Examiner's Answer did not address these arguments, but instead simply repeated the reasons for combination given in the Office Action dated June 30, 2005 verbatim.

The Appeal Brief argued that the sections of Colby (Column 7, line 58-Column 8, line 15 and Column 16, lines 40-65) relied upon by the Examiner to reject Claims 32 and 64 do not describe the elements of the claims. The cited sections of Colby describe the selection of a server based upon the proximity of the server to the requesting client and the determination of flow pipe bandwidth. The cited sections of Colby do not describe the claimed elements of (i) determining physical distances between said network clients and the inferable network client and (ii) computing a weighted average of said latency measurements as a function of said distances, wherein said weighted average comprises an estimate of the latency between said network server and said inferable network client. The Examiner failed to address these arguments in the Examiner's Answer.

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

APR 02 2007

III. Conclusion

For at least the reasons given in the Appeal Brief and this Reply Brief, it is respectfully requested that the final rejection be reversed and that Claims 1-21, 32-53 and 64 be allowed.

A Request for Oral Hearing accompanies this brief.

Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 11-0855, and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

By:



Brenda Ozaki Holmes  
Registration No. 40,339

Kilpatrick Stockton LLP  
1100 Peachtree Street  
Suite 2800  
Atlanta, Georgia 30309  
(404) 815-6500